DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 994 JC 760 447

AUTHOR Fay, Josephine M.
TITLE Dominant Values--More Alike Than Different.
PUB DATE 16 Jun 76
NOTE 36p.; Seminar paper, University of California, Los Angeles

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Literature Reviews; *Personal Values; Police; Priests; *Professional Occupations; Research; Social Values; Teachers; *Values
IDENTIFIERS *Rokeach Terminal Value Survey

ABSTRACT

The data presented in this paper result from the administration of the Rokeach Terminal Value Survey by several researchers to professors in four-year and two-year institutions of higher education, to grade and high school teachers, to priests, to businessmen, and to policemen. The data were collected from a number of different studies conducted over approximately a seven-year time span; in addition, and because the studies were conducted independently, some of the results are expressed in medians and some in means. An examination of the rankings of 18 values listed on the Rokeach Terminal Value Survey reveals a greater congruency than difference in priority rankings of professors in various academic disciplines, among professors in four-year and two-year institutions of higher education, and even among secondary school teachers. A similar pattern of preferred values emerges from persons engaged in non-academic occupations. Without exception, the top priority values (the highest three to five values) include values centering on the self; in only a few samples do the top priority values include social values. Form E of the Rokeach Terminal Value Survey is appended. (Author/JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED126994

Dominant Values--
More Alike Than Different

Josephine M. Fay
Education 261D
June 16, 1976

JC 760 447

Introduction

Do the values of college instructors differ from those of people in other professions and occupations? That is the central question of this paper. The work we do, it is commonly assumed, molds our whole life, and so do the values we cherish. The connection between values and teaching is one aspect of the continuing research of Cohen and Brawer on the faculty of community colleges (Brawer, 1971; Cohen and Brawer, 1972; Park, 1971). In 1969, Cohen and Brawer surveyed a sample of two-year college faculty in California, and in 1975 they surveyed a national sample. Included in their survey was the Rokeach Terminal Value Survey (Rokeach, 1968). Research on values using the Rokeach Value Survey forms the framework for the investigation of values in this paper, within the larger context of the Cohen and Brawer Faculty Survey.

The main hypothesis of this paper is that faculty can be distinguished from other occupational groups by their dominant values and that humanities faculty differ from non-humanities faculty in their values and preferences. This hypothesis is supported by different responses of various segments of the population to different motivations, or different values, whether measured by Rokeach whose research is predicated on this position or by other instruments (Centers and Bugental, 1966; Bhattacharya, 1973; Saleh, Toye, and Sievert, 1975). Differences in the faculty manifest themselves in the broad contrast Roe (1956) found between

a concern with things on the part of natural scientists and a concern with people by social scientists, perhaps a reflection of basic differences in life style in which values are central. Again, it is believed that humanities are associated with human choices and with values crucial to human existence and well being.

Furthermore, it is my hypothesis that instructors in two-year colleges will show value preferences that differ from their colleagues in four-year institutions. The rationale is that two-year colleges are primarily teaching institutions (Cohen and Brawer, 1972). The focus in these colleges is on causing student learning rather than on the disciplinary scholarship and research fostered by the universities; the difference in institutional purpose and emphasis should be expressed by the value systems of the instructional staff. Hence it is expected that instructors in four-year institutions of higher education will typically respond differently to a value survey than those in two-year instituions. And it is certainly expected that professors differ from elementary and high school teachers.

In this paper we are looking only at what Rokeach calls terminal values. These are true values, ends in themselves. Instrumental values, for Rokeach and for others as well, are means, ways of behaving or acting for the sake of another end. Instrumental values may be values in their own right, as intermediate values, but they are ordered to further ends which are not, in turn, directed to still more ultimate ends. In addition to the primary purpose of

this paper, testing the hypothesis of differences in patternings of dominant values for humanities and non-humanities faculty, we may also be able to assess the sensitivity of Rokeach's Terminal Value Survey in discerning differences held to exist on other grounds.

The Research Instrument--Milton Rokeach's Work

Rokeach's approach to values is phenomenological; that is, he approaches values from the point of view of a subjective ordering of value rather than from the viewpoint that value inheres objectively in an object. This is an important distinction in the literature on value, and it has important implications for research. Rokeach says that by focusing on the subjective aspect of value it is possible to keep the number of values manageably small, whereas the number of objects of value is potentially immeasurable (1973: 4). Consistent with his subjective approach, Rokeach defines value as "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct of end-state of existence" (1973: 5).

Beliefs concerning desirable modes of conduct are instrumental values, and beliefs about end-states of existence are terminal values. The distinction between means and ends is well enough established to justify Rokeach's theoretical elaboration and his use of two sets of values in research. From reviewing the literature, from his own values, from students of psychology, and from a sampling of adults,

Rokeach distilled 18 terminal values from a much larger list. He takes for granted that these are common human values which differ from person to person in order of importance with respect to one another.

But the values are not simply disparate beliefs about desirable states of being; they are organized by each person into a system of priorities. The concept of a value system assumes that certain values are preponderant over the rest. The 18 terminal values are not "equal" in their influence as ends of behavior. Some are more important, some less. This arrangement into greater or lesser importance, in the sense that if a choice were necessary Value "A" would be selected and value "B" abandoned is what Rokeach means by value hierarchy. The value survey rests on the conviction that names of values, amplified by simple descriptions or qualifying phrases, will suffice to elicit a general pattern, an individual value system.

Rokeach's complete Value Survey consists of a list of 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values, alphabetically arranged, with a brief description in parentheses accompanying each value. Thus the value a comfortable life is described as a prosperous life in parentheses. The instructions to the respondent are to arrange the values "in order of their importance to YOU, as guiding principles in YOUR life." (Capitalization is Rokeach's.) Only positive values are included; nothing bad or wrong or undesirable appears to make things easy for the respondent. Rokeach reports that his subjects find

the task of ranking difficult. Since all the values are positive, he reasons, the rankings must be subjective; since the respondent has to rely on his own internalized value system as a principle of organization, the value scale takes on some characteristics of a projective test (such as the Rorschach or the Thematic Apperception Test). At the same time, the structured nature of the items yields rankings that can be described readily in quantitative terms. Rokeach says that the Value Survey was designed as an all-purpose instrument for research on human values (1973: 5). A copy of Form E of Rokeach's Value Survey (of terminal values) is attached in appendix A.

The reliability of the Value Survey has been established by research at Michigan State University. Various forms of the test have been used; Form E, the form used in the Faculty Survey by Cohen and Braver, requires the respondent to rank the values by writings the numbers from 1 to 18 in blank spaces next to the name of the value. Test-retest reliabilities for this form are usually about .74 for terminal values.

Review of the Literature

A - Faculty Values

In view of the importance of occupation in adult life, it is not surprising that the commitment to a discipline to which a faculty member devotes his energies and which he teaches in a classroom should influence his perceptions of value. There are,

to be sure, common characteristics of professors: objectivity, breadth of view, tolerance for the opinions of others, the ability to engage the attention of students, and so on. But besides these academic virtues, more or less shared, data from research on values indicate differences along disciplinary lines.

In a survey of faculty at three community colleges in Southern California by Cohen and Brawer (Brawer, 1971: 60), the highest ranking value of the teaching staff, taken as a whole, was self-respect, with a sense of accomplishment second and freedom third. For the humanities faculty, family security ranked first, a sense of accomplishment was second, and self-respect third. In the very small sample of faculty teaching languages (only 5 respondents), self-respect was first, family security second, and freedom third. Thus the humanities/language faculty rank family security among their top values, in contrast to the other faculty. Surprisingly, a world of beauty appears in the lower half of the value patternings of all faculty, receiving the highest ranking (ninth) by social scientists rather than by persons associated with humanistic studies.

Table 1 shows the terminal values for the humanities faculty and for several other disciplines, as well as for the total faculty sample.

Table 1. Median and Ranks for Staff Academic Groups in Ordering of Terminal Values*

	Business Admin		Engineer/ Tech		Humanities/ Arts		Languages		Math/Nat. Sciences		Social Sciences		Other		Total Staff	
N =	16		11		23		5		25		29		46		155	
	Median	Rank	Median	Rank	Median	Rank	Median	Rank	Median	Rank	Median	Rank	Median	Rank	Median	Rank
A comfortable life	7.00	6.5	7.50	7.5	10.00	12	8.50	9.5	12.50	14	14.00	15	11.58	12	11.70	13
Equality	11.50	12.5	9.50	11	10.00	12	9.50	12	10.00	10	8.50	8	7.88	8.5	9.35	11
Exciting life	7.00	6.5	12.50	15	7.00	6	7.50	7.5	9.50	9	10.00	11.5	9.75	11	8.75	10
Family security	7.50	8	8.50	9.5	4.00	1	4.00	2	10.50	12.5	10.00	11.5	6.75	4.5	7.58	7
Freedom	6.67	4	7.50	7.5	8.00	8	4.50	3	6.75	5	7.50	6	4.75	1	6.57	3
Happiness	5.50	2	5.50	3	8.50	9	9.00	11	7.00	6.5	9.50	10	6.75	4.5	7.32	6
Inner harmony	6.75	5	4.50	1	6.50	4.5	6.50	5.5	6.17	4	7.83	7	7.13	6	7.00	5
Mature love	9.00	10	10.50	12	7.75	7	6.50	5.5	7.83	8	5.10	3	9.14	10	8.10	9
National security	13.75	15	11.50	13.5	15.50	17	15.50	16.5	15.25	17	16.25	17	14.29	17	15.09	17
Pleasure	13.75	15	11.50	13.5	14.00	16	12.50	13	13.50	15.5	14.50	16	12.75	14	13.44	16
Salvation	15.00	18	15.50	17.5	17.50	18	17.75	18	17.50	18	17.67	18	17.08	18	17.25	18
Self respect	3.13	1	5.50	3	5.83	3	2.50	1	4.25	1	4.75	2	5.00	2	4.93	1
Sense of accompl.	6.50	3	5.50	3	5.17	2	8.50	9.5	4.50	2	4.00	1	6.13	3	5.50	2
Social recognition	14.75	17	14.50	16	12.17	15	15.50	16.5	13.50	15.5	11.00	13	12.94	15	12.94	15
True friendship	8.75	9	6.50	5	11.50	14	7.50	7.5	7.00	6.5	5.70	5	7.88	8.5	7.71	8
Wisdom	9.50	11	7.17	6	6.50	4.5	5.50	4	4.90	3	5.50	4	7.75	7	6.81	4
World at peace	13.75	15	15.50	17.5	9.50	10	14.50	15	10.17	11	12.50	14	13.25	16	12.62	14
World of beauty	11.50	12.5	8.50	9.5	10.00	12	13.50	14	10.50	12.5	9.17	9	11.75	13	10.36	12

*Braver (1971: 60)

Pritchett (1973) used the Rokeach Value Survey to develop a profile of values held by full-time professional staff members of Oregon's community colleges. She found that self respect and a sense of accomplishment were reported to be most important by the Oregon faculty. This finding is consistent with the rankings in the California survey reported by Braver.

Similar results were obtained with the Rokeach Value Survey for members of two large public universities in Michigan (Rokeach 1973: 144-150). Five academic fields were surveyed: biological sciences, physical sciences, social sciences, the arts, and business. The data from these samples provide an approximation of academic values for the two institutions in 1969. The findings are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Terminal Value Medians and Composite Rank Orders for 5 Academic Fields (Michigan State and Wayne State Universities, 1969)*

	Business		Biological Sciences		Physical Sciences		Social Sciences		Art	
N =	38		51		51		50		22	
A comfortable life	11.8	(13)	14.8	(16)	14.7	(15)	14.9	(15)	14.1	(15)
An exciting life	9.8	(9)	9.2	(8)	8.0	(7)	8.5	(8)	12.5	(14)
A sense of accompl.	5.0	(3)	2.8	(1)	4.0	(1)	3.3	(1)	3.2	(2)
A world at peace	8.3	(6)	7.1	(6)	9.0	(9)	7.3	(7)	8.0	(6)
A world of beauty	13.5	(14)	11.3	(12)	10.3	(11)	11.3	(12)	7.0	(5)
Equality	8.9	(7)	7.2	(7)	8.4	(8)	5.0	(3)	8.0	(7)
Family security	4.2	(1)	5.1	(4)	5.3	(4)	5.5	(5)	8.5	(8)
**Freedom	4.8	(2)	6.5	(5)	4.3	(2)	5.7	(6)	8.5	(8)
Happiness	9.8	(10)	10.6	(11)	11.8	(13)	12.3	(13)	11.2	(12)
Inner harmony	9.3	(8)	9.4	(9)	7.3	(6)	9.0	(9)	4.8	(3)
Mature love	10.5	(11)	11.6	(13)	9.6	(19)	9.3	(10)	9.5	(10)
National security	14.5	(17)	13.7	(15)	15.3	(17)	16.5	(17)	15.5	(17)
**Pleasure	14.3	(15)	16.1	(17)	14.9	(16)	15.1	(16)	14.8	(16)
Salvation	15.5	(18)	17.3	(19)	17.7	(18)	17.6	(18)	17.7	(18)
Self respect	5.5	(4)	4.3	(2)	5.0	(3)	4.3	(2)	5.5	(4)
Social recognition	14.5	(16)	12.9	(14)	14.3	(14)	12.3	(14)	12.5	(13)
True friendship	11.5	(12)	9.8	(10)	11.1	(12)	11.1	(11)	11.0	(11)
Wisdom	5.8	(5)	5.0	(3)	5.6	(5)	5.3	(4)	1.5	(1)

* Rokeach (1973: 145)
** Not statistically significant (Rokeach 1973: 144)

The greatest unanimity appears in the rankings of the various scientists, for whom a sense of accomplishment is first, followed by self-respect for the biological and social scientists and by freedom for the physical scientists. Wisdom is ranked third by the biological scientists, self-respect is third for the physical scientists, and equality for the social sciences (a sign perhaps of professional commitment). The art faculty, on the other hand, ranks wisdom first, a sense of accomplishment second, and inner harmony third, whereas family security is first for faculty members in the area of business, freedom is second, and a sense of accomplishment third. The only value that appears in the top three rankings for all academic areas is a sense of accomplishment, but self-respect is among the top four values, ranking fourth for both business and art faculty.

We have seen that a sense of accomplishment and self-respect were the most important values for the Oregon community college faculty and also for the sample of Southern California faculty studied by Cohen and Brawer in 1969. For the four-year college faculty, a sense of accomplishment is among the top three values for all faculty surveyed, and self-respect is among the top four for all groups. Hence we find remarkable agreement in dominant value patternings across institutions, in opposition to our hypothesis that faculty in four-year institutions would differ from those in two-year institutions. We shall see, later, whether the national sample of instructors in two-year colleges is distinguished from those in senior institutions in regard to value preferences.

B - Teachers' Values

Do teachers in grade and high schools have different value hierarchies than professors in higher education? Two studies of teachers show both likeness and difference. In an Ohio metropolitan area, 43 teachers filled out the Rokeach Value Survey. The results for terminal values are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Terminal Value Medians and Rankings for Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in the Toledo Metropolitan Area (Sikula et al, 1972)*

	Elementary		Secondary	
N =	25		23	
A comfortable life	14.6	(16)	11.4	(13)
An exciting life	14.3	(15)	9.4	(10)
A sense of accomplishment	8.8	(9.5)	5.7	(4)
A world of beauty	13.0	(13)	11.4	(12)
A world at peace	6.0	(4.5)	12.3	(14)
Equality	4.3	(1)	9.7	(11)
Family security	5.7	(3)	5.1	(3)
Freedom	6.0	(4.5)	7.6	(7)
Happiness	7.9	(8)	6.4	(5)
Inner harmony	7.0	(6)	8.6	(8)
Mature love	9.3	(11)	7.3	(6)
National security	13.4	(14)	16.8	(17)
Pleasure	15.6	(18)	14.4	(16)
Salvation	8.8	(9.5)	17.3	(18)
Self-respect	5.6	(2)	4.2	(2)
Social recognition	15.3	(17)	13.7	(15)
True friendship	10.0	(12)	9.0	(9)
Wisdom	7.4	(7)	3.7	(1)

*Sikula et al, 1972: 462.

What stands out in this table is the ranking of equality by elementary school teachers. A breakdown into inner-city and

and suburban shows that the only significant difference between these two groups of elementary teachers is in the priority attached to equality. Inner-city teachers rank this value significantly much higher than suburban teachers (a median of 3.0 for the inner-city teachers versus 11.2 for the suburban teachers) (Sikula et al, 1972: 463-465). Elementary school teachers may assign a higher relative rank to values taught to young children: an emphasis on equality and a world at peace is important, especially in the inner-city. On the other hand, the dominant values of the secondary school teachers, giving highest priority to wisdom, self-respect, family security, and a sense of accomplishment, in that order, hardly distinguish them from the professors.

The second study, of elementary school teachers only, took place in a university community in Arizona. Teachers in four elementary schools filled out the Rokeach Value Survey, with results for terminal values as follows:

Table 4. Terminal Value Means for Teachers in Four Elementary Schools in Tempe, Arizona (Jenkins et al, 1974)*

N = 61

Family security	5.30	(1)
Inner harmony	5.70	(2)
Self-respect	6.20	(3)
Wisdom	6.56	(4)
Happiness	7.37	(5)
True friendship	7.88	(6)
Sense of accomplishment	8.10	(7)
Freedom	8.26	(8)
Mature love	8.73	(9)
World at peace	8.91	(10)
Equality	9.65	(11)
Salvation	11.60	(12)
World of beauty	11.71	(13)
Comfortable life	11.74	(14)
Exciting life	12.07	(15)
Social recognition	13.42	(16)
National security	13.67	(17)
Pleasure	14.14	(18)

*Jenkins et al, 1974: 63.

This group is closer to the secondary teachers in the previous study and also closer to the professors than it is to the other sample of elementary school teachers. Elementary teachers in both samples rank self-respect and family security within the top five values. The only group of persons associated with the field of education who can be clearly distinguished from the others on the basis of priority of value assignments, as measured by responses to Rokeach's Terminal Value Survey, is the elementary school teachers from a metropolitan area in the Midwest, and the major difference there--the highest value assigned to equality and a relatively high value to a world at peace--can be attributed to the significantly higher rankings of these values by the 12 inner-city teachers who were part of this group.

C - Other Occupational Values

The desirability of achieving congruence between personal characteristics, abilities, goals, and aspirations and a career or life-work is the basis of vocational and career counseling and guidance. There are some good practical reasons for thinking that businessmen value money, physicians value health, and teachers learning. There is also evidence that workers in other occupations rank security values higher than employees in professional-managerial occupations where values of self-expression predominate (Centers and Bugental, 1866; Hill, 1975).

The value patterns of a police force in a midwestern city were studied by Rokeach, Miller, and Snyder (1971), revealing the following order of terminal values.

Table 5. Terminal Value Medians and Rank Orders for Policemen*

N = 153		
A comfortable life	8.0	(8)
An exciting life	12.9	(15)
A sense of accomplishment	7.3	(5)
A world at peace	5.3	(2)
A world of beauty	16.0	(18)
Equality	11.7	(14)
Family security	2.9	(1)
Freedom	5.3	(3)
Happiness	7.7	(6)
Inner harmony	11.3	(13)
Mature love	10.2	(10)
National security	11.1	(12)
Pleasure	13.7	(16)
Salvation	10.5	(11)
Self-respect	7.0	(4)
Social recognition	14.4	(17)
True friendship	9.1	(9)
Wisdom	8.0	(7)

*Rokeach, Miller, and Snyder, 1971: 161.

The highest priority of policemen is the personal value of family security, followed by a world at peace and freedom. The high value accorded the ideal of peace fits the image of law enforcement officers safeguarding law and order rather than pursuing crime and punishment. Attention may be called to Rokeach's description of a world at peace, which uses the word "free," since freedom is rated by the policement as their third dominant value.

The similarity of policemen's value rankings to those of college faculty in regard to dominant values is greater than the difference. Policemen value self-respect and a sense of accomplishment fourth and fifth; these are the top-ranking values for the professors. And the sample of humanities faculty reported by Braver (Table 1) places the first value on family security, in total agreement with policemen. Grade and high school teachers also include self-respect and family security in their dominant value patterns.

A departure from these consistent trends occurs in a study of the values of Catholic priests and seminarians undertaken by Hague (1968). While we are not concerned with students in this paper, the comparison throws some light on the theoretical question of whether values may be said to "cause" or result from vocational choice.

Table 5. Terminal Value Means and Composite Ranks for Catholic Priests and Seminarians in Canada*

A comfortable life	15.9	(18)	15.5	(17)
An exciting life	11.6	(13)	12.9	(14)
A sense of accomplishment	6.3	(4)	8.9	(10)
A world at peace	9.0	(10)	9.1	(11)
A world of beauty	12.3	(15)	12.9	(15)
Equality	8.8	(9)	8.0	(7)
Family security	11.2	(12)	10.1	(12)
Freedom	8.1	(7)	8.4	(8)
Happiness	6.3	(3)	6.5	(5)
Inner harmony	7.0	(6)	6.1	(4)
Mature love	10.3	(11)	7.6	(6)
National security	12.8	(16)	14.4	(16)
Pleasure	15.7	(17)	14.6	(18)
Salvation	3.7	(1)	3.1	(1)
Self-respect	8.8	(9)	8.9	(9)
Social recognition	11.9	(13)	12.3	(13)
True friendship	6.5	(3)	6.0	(3)
Wisdom	4.4	(2)	4.8	(2)

*Reported in Rokeach, 1973: 153.

Priests and seminarians have quite similar dominant values, ranking salvation and wisdom first and second; they differ, however, in regard to the third and fourth values, priests ranking happiness third and a sense of accomplishment fourth, while seminarians rank true friendship third and inner harmony fourth. There is strong agreement on other value rankings, the only major shifts occurring in a sense of accomplishment (ranked tenth by seminarians) and mature love (eleventh for priests and sixth for seminarians). Perhaps this concurrence in value rankings confirms the theory of self-selection in occupational choice along the dimension of values although not necessarily in regard to aptitude level (Anderson and Olson, 1965).

It is also interesting that the values of Canadian clergymen do not fall into the typical pattern that Rokeach has discovered. According to him, all religious groups consider a world at peace, family security, and freedom among the most important terminal values; an exciting life, pleasure, social recognition, and a world of beauty are the least important (Rokeach, 1973: 82). The sample of religious that Hague investigated do not agree with all religious groups in regard to the highest priority terminal values, but they do agree on the least important values.

Rokeach reports value data collected by a marketing research organization from small entrepreneurs and salesmen (Rokeach, 1973: 157). The service station dealers were up to 70 years old, and the oil company salesmen were mostly between 21 and 40.

Table 6. Terminal Value Medians and Composite Ranks for Service Station Dealers and Oil Company Salesmen*

	Service Station Dealers		Oil Co. Salesmen	
N =	235		69	
A comfortable life	4.54	(2)	7.13	(5)
An exciting life	10.96	(10)	8.42	(8)
A sense of accomplishment	5.83	(4)	3.91	(2)
A world at peace	8.93	(8)	12.63	(14)
A world of beauty	14.63	(17)	15.33	(16)
Equality	12.54	(14)	13.92	(15)
Family security	2.26	(1)	2.89	(1)
Freedom	7.18	(6)	8.40	(7)
Happiness	5.52	(3)	6.56	(4)
Inner harmony	11.47	(12)	9.22	(9)
Mature love	11.62	(13)	8.38	(6)
National security	13.63	(16)	15.88	(18)
Pleasure	11.36	(11)	12.25	(13)
Salvation	14.67	(18)	15.63	(17)
Self respect	6.24	(5)	5.00	(3)
Social recognition	12.94	(15)	10.82	(12)
True friendship	8.97	(9)	9.69	(11)
Wisdom	8.88	(8)	9.25	(10)

*Rokeach, 1973: 157.

The close similarity between service station dealers and oil company salesmen (despite the broader range of ages in the larger sample of service station dealers) is not strange, since they are involved in the same major industry. Both groups agree with the policemen in assigning top value to family security. Although the rankings are not exactly the same, they do agree on the dominant values of a comfortable life, a sense of accomplishment, happiness, and self-respect. Emphasis is on personal achievement and material well-being. Self-respect and a sense of accomplishment, which were among the highest priority values among faculty members, are also among the highest priority values of the lower-level businessmen associated with the automobile industry. Grade and high school teachers generally concur with these value priorities.

Besides the low rankings of national security and salvation, common to all groups with the exception of salvation for priests and seminarians, the subjects in the samples from the automobile industry have low aesthetic needs, valuing a world of beauty third from last in the case of oil company salesmen and second last by service station dealers. Professors of business in both four-year and two-year institutions agree with this low evaluation. Business faculty (theoreticians) are as close to businessmen (practitioners) on this value as they are to other faculty members. Grade school teachers rank a world of beauty thirteenth and high school teachers report it as twelfth. Policemen ranked it last, priests and seminarians ranked it fifteenth, and the overall sample

of California two-year college instructors also ranked it twelfth. In fact, from the data presented so far, artists appear to be the only segment of the surveyed population for whom a world of beauty is an important value. This value may distinguish them, as salvation distinguishes professional commitments to religion. These may be clear cases of the coincidence of value priority and vocational choice. And these are both relatively unusual careers in a secular culture and a society geared to business and industry.

Confirming data on the low ranking of a world of beauty come from a survey of the values of recreational vehicle owners who are identified as blue-collar workers (Hill, 1975). Rokeach's Terminal Value Survey was administered to fifty subjects, owners of recreational vehicles and their spouses, at two campsites in Southern California. Rankings are reported in Table 7.

Table 7. Rankings of Terminal Values by Fifty Recreational Vehicle Owners (determined by averaging median scores with mean scores)*

N = 50

1. Freedom
2. Family security
3. Happiness
4. Wisdom
5. A comfortable life
6. Self-respect
7. True friendship
8. A sense of accomplishment
9. A world at peace
10. Inner harmony
11. Pleasure
12. Mature love
13. Equality
14. A world of beauty
15. Social recognition
16. Salvation
17. Exciting life
18. National security

*Hill, 1975: 14.

The low ranking of a world of beauty, which is accompanied on the Value Survey by "beauty of art and nature" (italics mine), is all the more striking because recreational vehicle owners use their vehicles to leave the city for vacations in the open country. This predeliction for recreation away from the city and close to nature, one would think, would be reflected in a high evaluation of a world of beauty. But it ranks fourteenth. Hill suggests that it would be interesting to compare the values of Sierra Club members with those of recreational vehicle owners.

If we consider the recreational vehicle owners as blue-collar workers, their dominant values differ from those of the businessmen associated with the automobile industry. The oil company salesmen and the service station dealers do not include freedom in their dominant values, nor do they include wisdom. Happiness is ranked high by priests, by teachers of business, and by engineer-technology instructors in two-year colleges. Happiness is also the fifth or sixth value for policemen, for secondary school teachers, and for grade school teachers in Arizona. If we examine the various tables presented thus far, there does not seem to be a consistent evaluation of happiness. Happiness and freedom for the recreational vehicle owners do not add up to an exciting life, described by Rokeach as "a stimulating, active life," which is ranked seventeenth.

D Summary of the Literature

The review of the literature shows that the dominant values (the first three to five values) of various occupational groups do indeed differ. But they also agree. If we list the top values of the occupational (non-faculty) groups surveyed by the Rokeach instrument, the following patterns emerge.

	Policemen	Priests	Service Station Dealers	Oil Co. Salesmen	RV Owners/ Blue-collar Workers
N =	153	80	253	69	50
1.	Family sec.	Salvation	Family sec.	Family sec.	Freedom
2.	World/peace	Wisdom	Comf. life	Sense of acc.	Family sec.
3.	Freedom	Happiness	Happiness	Self-respect	Happiness
4.	Self-respect	Sense of acc.	Sense of acc.	Happiness	Wisdom
5.	Sense of acc.	True friendsh.	Self-respect	Comf. life	Comf. life

Putting together the faculty groups (some of which do not match precisely) for purposes of comparison, the value patterns of the highest ranking values are as follows:

Two-year institutions:

	Bus. Admin.	Human/Arts	Math/Nat. Sci.	Social Sci.
N =	16	23	25	29
1.	Self-respect	Family sec.	Self-respect	Sense of acc.
2.	Happiness	Sense of acc.	Sense of acc.	Self-respect
3.	Sense of acc.	Self-respect	Wisdom	Mature love
4.	Freedom	4.5 Inner harmony	Inner harmony	Wisdom
5.	Inner harmony	4.5 Wisdom	Freedom	True friendsh.

Four-year institutions:

	Business	Art	Physical Sci.	Social Sci.
N =	38	22	51	50
1.	Family sec.	Wisdom	Sense of acc.	Sense of acc.
*2.	Freedom	Sense of acc.	Freedom	Self-respect
3.	Sense of acc.	Inner harmony	Self-respect	Equality
4.	Self-respect	Self-respect	Family sec.	Wisdom
5.	Wisdom	World/beauty	Wisdom	Family sec.

*Terminal value freedom is not statistically significant (Rokeach 1973: 144).

Finally, the dominant values for the three samples of school teachers:

	Elementary School Teachers		Secondary School Teachers
	Toledo, Ohio	Tempe, Arizona	Toledo, Ohio
N =	25	61	23
1.	Equality	1. Family security	1. Wisdom
2.	Self-respect	2. Inner harmony	2. Self-respect
3.	Family security	3. Self-respect	3. Family security
4.5	Freedom	4. Wisdom	4. A sense of accompl.
4.5	World/peace	5. Happiness	5. Happiness

In setting these rankings side by side for comparison, we must bear in mind differences in sample size, in reporting means and medians, and in administering the survey over at least a six-year span of time. With these cautions in interpretation, we can see that several values characterize almost all groups. Self-respect is found among the top values of all groups except priests and recreational vehicle owners. A sense of accomplishment is ranked very high by all groups except recreational vehicle owners (blue-collar workers) and grade school teachers. Pritchett (1973), it may be noted here, found that the top two values among the Oregon faculty of two-year colleges were self-respect and a sense of accomplishment.

Family security is another widely shared value, with several exceptions. That priests (and seminarians) do not place this among their top values is understandable. Oddly, though, it is absent from the dominant values of two-year faculty, with the outstanding

exception of the humanities faculty who rank it first, in precise opposition to the four-year college faculty, all of whom include family security among the top values except the art faculty.

Humanities faculty values—a sense of accomplishment, self-respect, inner harmony, and wisdom—are widely shared by two-year and four-year college faculty; all faculty agree on at least three out of four of these highest-ranking values, and the mathematics/natural science faculty in two-year colleges agrees on all four of them. High school teachers also agree with the general configuration of dominant faculty values, and so does the sample of grade school teachers from a middle-class university community.

Priests are a special category among the occupational groups. Their evaluation of salvation contrasts with the general evaluation of a secular society in which salvation is the least of everyone's concerns. But priests have an education that is the equivalent of college faculty; their top values include only two of those valued by the faculty: wisdom and sense of accomplishment. The self-respect so highly prized by faculty and by almost everyone else is ranked ninth by priests and seminarians.

The distinction between a concern for things and for people (Roe, 1956) is sustained by the value pattern of the social scientists which includes love, friendship, and equality, absent from the natural scientists. What is striking is the congruence between the values of policemen and academic values—closer than that between priests and faculty members. The single value peculiar to policemen,

a world at peace, reflects no doubt their positive orientation toward a safe world; national security is ranked twelfth by policemen, the highest ranking of this consistently low-priority value among all groups.

We can draw this part of the review to a close by noting the following associations that are unique to groups as we have examined them, as they respond to the Rokeach Survey of Terminal Values.

Faculty/ Occupational Group	Associated with	Terminal Value
Faculty artists		A world of beauty
Faculty social scientists		Mature love (two-year colleges) True friendship (two-year colleges) Equality (four-year universities)
Grade school teachers		Equality (one sample)
Priests		Salvation
Policemen		A world at peace

With the exceptions of the values of policemen and grade school teachers, these associations might have been predicted in advance of a value survey.

Values of a National Sample of Instructors in Two-Year Colleges

We turn now to the main hypothesis of this study, namely, that the humanities faculty will show a different alignment of values than non-humanities faculty. We had anticipated, based on the traditional association of humanities with human values and on research on values of two-year college faculty (Brawer, 1971) that this would be the case. Alas, there is really not much difference. Table 8 shows the results of the administration of the Rokeach Terminal Value Survey as part of the Cohen and Brawer Faculty Survey of a national sample of instructors in two-year institutions in 1975.

Table 9. Terminal Value Medians and Composite Rank Order for Humanities and Non-Humanities Faculty in Two-Year Colleges (1975)*

	Humanities Faculty		Non-Humanities Faculty	
N =	1493		467	
Self-respect	4.23	(1)	Family sec.	4.03 (1)
Wisdom	4.78	(2)	Self-respect	4.04 (2)
Inner harmony	5.00	(3)	Inner harmony	5.71 (3)
Family security	5.58	(4)	Sense of accompl.	5.75 (4)
Freedom	6.12	(5)	Freedom	6.16 (5)
Sense of accompl.	6.39	(6)	Happiness	6.44 (6)
Happiness	6.71	(7)	Wisdom	6.63 (7)
Mature love	6.74	(8)	True friendship	7.32 (8)
True friendship	7.68	(9)	Mature love	8.03 (9)
Exciting life	9.89	(10)	Equality	10.45 (10)
Equality	9.97	(11)	Exciting life	11.07 (11)
World at peace	10.52	(12)	Comfortable life	11.19 (12)
World/beauty	10.97	(13)	World at peace	11.57 (13)
Comfortable life	12.76	(14)	Social recog.	12.37 (14)
Social recog.	12.96	(15)	World/beauty	13.22 (15)
Pleasure	13.57	(16)	Pleasure	13.26 (16)
National sec.	15.25	(17)	National security	14.03 (17)
Salvation	16.16	(18)	Salvation	14.69 (18)

Examination of the comparative rankings show some shiftings, except at the very bottom of the lists, but it does not show an unambiguous delineation between the groups. That is, we cannot look at one set of value rankings and say that this is indeed what we anticipated for, say, the humanities faculty. The two rankings are more similar than not. This is contrary to our original hypothesis and also contrary to Rokeach. He claims that the value survey discriminates between many different groups (1973, passim). The approach taken in this paper has been to look at value systems from the aspect of the highest ranking values, the top priorities. In the value system, according to Rokeach, the ranking of a given value as more important than another has practical implications. If freedom, say, is preferred to family security, this means that family security would be sacrificed in the event of a conflict with freedom. Now, by attending to the top values in the value systems, we can see the salient terminal values for the several groups. And contrary to Rokeach and to our hypothesis, the values are quite like each other. Given a conflict situation, both humanities and non-humanities faculty in two-year colleges would prefer family security to freedom, and so would the rest of the groups studied. The very high priority accorded self-respect by both groups is also generally characteristic of the populations examined in this paper.

The three highest values for the humanities faculty (self-respect, wisdom, and inner harmony) are personal values. These are the end-state of existence, to use Rokeach's terminology, most prized and

cherished by these faculty members. The fourth value is family security (taking care of loved ones) and the fifth is freedom. Sixth is a sense of accomplishment, or making a lasting contribution. Here we reach a value that can be interpreted as directed toward others, toward making a contribution to the education of students. A sense of accomplishment was ranked second by the much smaller group of humanities/arts faculty in 1969 but also second by the faculty taken as a whole (Brawer, 1971). We may perhaps explain this downward shift to stand for a lessened concern for achievement and for social values and, in light of the values which supersede it in the pattern, a greater concern for personal and private values. Rokeach says that a sense of accomplishment, family security, inner harmony, and wisdom are typical of the affluent in our society (1973: 62). We may then look at two-year college instructors as sharing the dominant value systems associated with affluence, with self-realization, and with educational attainment. That these values are subjective and personal and that even a sense of accomplishment does not disturb this subjective strain is evident from Rokeach's selection of the word sense, meaning a feeling of accomplishment. What is important is the feeling, the subjective conviction of making a contribution, in contrast to the more "objective" criterion, social recognition (respect or admiration) which is one of the lower-priority values, not only for faculty but consistently for the groups surveyed.

The values of the humanities faculty are close to those of the other faculty who participated in the survey. What we say of one

group applies to the other, with few qualifications. What, then, is the picture that emerges of faculty in two-year colleges in 1975? and, assuming we can generalize (our previous review of the literature shows greater agreement than disagreement among all faculty people, even including secondary school teachers), what is the picture of the faculty in higher education?

The image of the faculty, as mirrored through the medium of priority responses to Rokeach's Terminal Value Survey, is that of intellectuals engaged in self-realizing pursuits and experiencing a sense of accomplishment in the education of students. We know on other grounds that the faculty are a disparate lot. One has only to open The Chronicle of Higher Education to become aware of this. (For example, The Chronicle, April 19, 1976 reported that the faculty disagree on whether they are intellectuals, professionals, scientists, or scholars, though most of them do regard themselves as teachers.) We know, too, that the colleges are concerned about the values of students, although the difficulty of teaching values appears insurmountable. Indeed, Jacob (1957) maintained that values cannot be taught and recently stated that he has seen no evidence to change his original position (Chronicle, Feb. 23, 1976). If faculty teach their own values, however unscientific and haphazard that teaching may be, the values communicated (if Rokeach's value survey is to be trusted) must be those associated with personal self-realization, with self-enhancement, and not those associated with the great social issues of our time.

Discussion

One of the great social issues of our time is equality of opportunity. Rokeach has noted the discrepancy in the rankings of freedom and equality in responses to the survey in his own research. Freedom, a personal value, is regularly ranked higher relatively than equality, a social value. In our samples, only social scientists in senior institutions of higher education and grade school teachers from an inner-city metropolitan area reversed this ranking. In addition, only priests and seminarians ranked the two values almost equally. Otherwise, freedom is simply preferred in relation to equality. In the 1975 survey of community college faculty by Cohen and Brawer, for instance, equality was ranked eleventh by the humanities faculty and tenth by the non-humanities faculty, while freedom was fifth for both groups.

Rokeach is correct in his judgment that people prefer their own value—personal, individual freedom—to a value that pertains to others—equality is one such value. It is the overwhelming trend of the evidence cited in this paper, based on research using Rokeach's value survey, that middle-class professionals in academe and in the business world prefer personal values to social values. Rokeach's experiments, in which he confronts people with the discrepancy in rankings of equality and freedom and observes the consequent shift toward consonance, represent conditioning efforts that are contrary to the value orientation of our time. That he is as successful as

his research indicates is all the more remarkable and is in direct opposition to the opinion of Jacobs.

Whether the rankings are an artifact of the testing instrument is, of course, questionable. Rokeach claims that all the values are positive. Maybe so. Patriotism, though outmoded, is a more positive word than national security, especially with its qualifying phrase, "protection from attack." National security, however, is current and was a controversial topic at the time when Rokeach decided on his list of values. This is one example of a value that might have been expressed in less negative and less value-laden terms. Another outmoded word is salvation. It is just possible that other people besides clergymen have religious commitments that influence their modes of conduct, but salvation does not capture the nature of such a commitment today. One can be religious without looking forward to salvation. These two values are so uniformly low in rank that they could be eliminated from the survey. Perhaps similar criticisms apply to the positively valued terms.

These considerations bear on the sensitivity of Rokeach's value survey to discern differences in value hierarchies. He claims that he has devised an all-purpose instrument; as such, it may be too blunt to discriminate between well-educated professionals—we have seen that even secondary school teachers are not much different from the samples from midwestern universities.

Summary and Conclusion

The data presented in this paper result from the administration of the Rokeach Terminal Value Survey to professors in four-year and two-year institutions of higher education, to grade and high school teachers, to priests, to businessmen, and to policemen. The data were collected over approximately a seven-year time span; they are derived from samples of different sizes; in addition, some of the results are expressed in medians and some in means.

An examination of the rankings of values listed on the Rokeach Terminal Value Survey reveals a greater congruency than difference in priority rankings of professors in various academic disciplines, among professors in four-year and two-year institutions of higher education, and even among secondary school teachers. A similar pattern of preferred values emerges from persons engaged in non-academic occupations.

Without exception, the top priority values (the highest three to five values) include values centering on the self; in only a few samples do the top priority values include social values.

Tables

		Page
Table 1.	Median and Ranks for Staff Academic Groups in Ordering of Terminal Values	7
Table 2.	Terminal Value Medians and Composite Rank Orders for 5 Academic Fields	8
Table 3.	Terminal Value Medians and Rankings for Elementary and Secondary School Teachers	10
Table 4.	Terminal Value Means for Teachers in Four Elementary Schools	12
Table 5.	Terminal Value Medians and Rank Orders for Policemen	13
Table 6.	Terminal Value Means and Composite Ranks for Catholic Priests and Seminarians	15
Table 7.	Terminal Value Medians and Composite Ranks for Service Station Dealers and Oil Company Salesmen	16
Table 8.	Rankings of Terminal Values by Fifty Recreational Vehicle Owners	18
Table 9.	Terminal Value Medians and Composite Rank Order for Humanities and Non-Humanities Faculty in Two-Year Colleges	24

Bibliography

Bhattacharya, S. K. A Study of Value System of Different Occupational Groups. Indian Journal of Psychology (48), 1973, 59-64.

Brawer, Florence B. Values and the Generation Gap: Junior College Freshmen and Faculty. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, monograph no. 11. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971.

Centers, Richard, and Bugental, Daphne E. Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Motivations among Different Segments of the Working Population. Journal of Applied Psychology (50), 1966, 193-197.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Brawer, Florence B. Confronting Identity: The Junior College Instructor. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Hague, W. Value Systems and Vocational Choice of the Priesthood. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, 1968. Cited in Rokeach, 1973: 153.

Hill, Andrew William. An Analysis of the Values of Recreational Vehicle Owners and Spouses through Application of the Rokeach Scale of Terminal Values. Unpublished paper. University of California, Los Angeles, 1975.

Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

Jenkins, Charles G., Anderson, Ethel C., and Wurster, Stanley R. A Look at Elementary School Teachers' Values. Arizona State University, 1974.

Park, Young. Junior College Faculty: Their Values and Perceptions. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, monograph no. 12. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Junior Colleges, 1971.

Pritchett, Betty Jensen. Values and Perceptions of Community College Professional Staff in Oregon. Dissertation Abstracts International (34) 1073, No. 1104.

Roe, Anne. The Making of a Scientist. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1956.

Rokeach, Milton, Miller, Martin G., and Snyder, John A. The Value Gap between Police and Policed. Journal of Social Issues (27) 1971, 155-171.

Rokeach, Milton. The Nature of Human Values. New York: Free Press, 1973.

Saley, S. D., Toye, J. R., and Sievert, H. A. Occupational Values, Environment, and Levels. Journal of Vocational Behavior (6) 1975, 235-243.

Sikula, John P., Jurs, Stephen G., and Sikula, Andrew F. Do Teachers Differ in Their Values? Education and Urban Society (IV) 1972, 459-466.

Anderson, Thomas B. and Olsen, Leroy C. Congruence of Self and Ideal-Self and Occupational Choices. Personnel and Guidance Journal (44), 1965, 171-176.

The Chronicle of Higher Education, Feb. 23 and March 1, 1976.

Appendix A

Rokeach Terminal Value Survey*

Below is a list of 18 values arranged in alphabetical order. We are interested in finding out the relative importance of these values to you. Study the list carefully and pick out the one value which is the most important for you. Place a 1 on the blank line to the left of this value and cross it off your list. Look at the remaining 17 values; which is second most important for you? Place a 2 next to this value and cross it off your list. Look at the ramaining 16 values and rank them in order of importance. The value which is least important should be ranked 18th.

_____ A comfortable life (a prosperous life)
_____ Equality (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)
_____ An exciting life (a stimulating, active life)
_____ Family security (taking care of loved ones)
_____ Freedom (independence, free choice)
_____ Happiness (contentedness)
_____ Inner harmony (freedom from inner conflict)
_____ Mature love (sexual and spiritual intimacy)
_____ National security (protection from attack)
_____ Pleasure (an enjoyable, leisurely life)
_____ Salvation (saved, eternal life)
_____ Self-respect (self-esteem)
_____ A sense of accomplishment (lasting contribution)
_____ Social recognition (respect, admiration)
_____ True friendship (close companionship)
_____ Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)
_____ A world at peace (free of war and conflict)
_____ A world of beauty (beauty of nature and the arts)

*Form E, as it appears in the Cohen and Brawer Faculty Survey.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 24 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES